

FISCAL NOTE WORKSHEET (Revised Nov. 2006)

Agency: Utah State Office of Education
Ben Leishman
 Requested By

Bill Number SB 41 3rd Sub

Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst
 W310 State Capitol Complex
 Salt Lake City, UT 84114-5310
 538-1034 / Fax 538-1692

Fax/Electronic Mail Transmittal

Date: _____
Name: _____
Fax Number: _____

Please return to Fiscal Analyst by: February 28, 2007

TITLE OF BILL: LOCAL ISSUES AMENDMENTS

This Bill Takes Effect: ☐ On Passage ☐ On July 1 ☒ 60 Days after session ☐ Other _____

Bill Carries Own Appropriation: ☒

FISCAL IMPACT OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

A. Revenue Impact by Source of Funds:

First Year

Second Year

	First Year	Second Year
1. General Fund	\$15,000	\$0
2. Uniform School Fund - Free Revenue		
3. Transportation Fund		
4. Collections		
5. Other Funds (List Below)		
6 Local Funds		
7. TOTAL	\$15,000	\$0

B. Expenditure Impact by Source of Funds:

1. General Funds		
2. Uniform School Fund - Free Revenue		
3. Transportation Fund		
4. Collections		
5. Other Funds (List Below)	\$15,000	\$0
6 Local Funds		
7. TOTAL	\$15,000	\$0

C. Expenditure Impact Summary:

1. Salaries, Wages and Benefits		
2. Travel		
3. Current Expenses		
4. Capital Outlay		
5. Other (Specify) Committee Expenses	\$15,000	\$0
6. TOTAL	\$15,000	\$0

D. Impact in Future Years?

If no fiscal impact in first two years, indicate if there will be any impact in future years, and explain. Also, indicate any significant changes in fiscal impact beyond the first two years. Use back side, if necessary.)

The bill only authorizes a single year study so no impacts could be beyond one year.

E. Identify Sections of the Bill That Will Generate the Additional Workload or Cost Increase

The cost increases are from committee estimates not from USOE.

F. Expenditure Impact Details (*Ties to totals in Section C*)

List and document methodology and/or assumptions used in determining need for workload and cost increase.

List number, type, and step ranges of personnel required, including benefits.

List details of other impacted expenditure categories as shown in Section C.

List additional space requirements and cost associated with requirements of this bill.

(USE ATTACHMENTS IF NECESSARY.)

None

G. No Fiscal Impact or Will Not Require Additional Appropriations?

Specify why this bill will have no fiscal impact on your agency or institution.

Specify how you will reallocate workloads, resources, or funding sources to eliminate need for additional appropriations. (USE ATTACHMENTS IF NECESSARY.)

None

H. If Bill Carries It's Own Appropriation:

Indicate if the amount appropriated is adequate to meet the purposes of the bill.

Are there future additional costs anticipated beyond the appropriation in the bill?

The costs in the appropriation should be sufficient to handle committee meetings.

I. Impact on Local Governments, Businesses, Associations, and Individuals

*Indicate costs or savings that are **DIRECT and MEASURABLE**. If direct and measurable data are not available, are there areas that potentially could have a fiscal impact? (USE ATTACHMENT IF NECESSARY.)*

Local School Districts/Charter Schools : The failure to enact SB 30 would leave many provisions of the small district creation process in limbo and would effectively make creation of new school districts more difficult due to the unaddressed items from last years legislation.

Businesses and Associations :

Individuals : This would make it more difficult for individuals to convince city bodies to create new school districts.

Narrative Description of Bill : This bill deals mainly with city ability to establish a manager form of government. In the process it indicates that if both SB 30 and SB 41 pass the that the new parts of SB 30 would not take effect. This is puzzling as the items addressed in both bills are widely divergent and not related to the untrained observer. The effect would be that many items addressed in SB 30 would be left undone and make creation of new school districts more difficult.